

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

At the outset, Applicant appreciates the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Advisory Action of January 23, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully noted. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Claim 2 was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-8 are currently pending in the application. Support for these amendments is provided in at least Figures 1-6 and related text of the specification. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,963,064 issued to Toyota, et al. ("Toyota"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 is allowable as it recites a combination of features including, *inter alia*,

a first transistor having ... a first electrode connected to said output and a second electrode connected to said input through a resistor.

Toyota fails to teach or suggest at least these features.

The Examiner asserts these features are taught by disclosing, a first transistor (M3 and M4) having a control electrode (M3 and M4 gate) coupled for receiving a bias voltage (Vcont), a first electrode connected to said output (M3 and M4 drain connected to I_{on}) and second electrode connected to said input (M3 connected to I_{np} through M1).

(Final Office Action at pages 2-3).

In contrast to these assertions, the first transistor, M3 or M4, does not have a second electrode connected to said input through a resistor as shown in FIG. 1. More particularly, M3 or M4 have a gate coupled to Vcont and the second electrode that is connected to node N1 and current 4ISS. The node N1 is also connected to a second electrode of M1 and M2, but it is not connected to the INP. The INP is connected to the gate of M1 in order to activate the transistor M1. Therefore, in contrast to the Examiner's position, there is no second electrode connected to an input through a resistor as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 7 and 8.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Toyota in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,682,098 issued to Seevnick, et al. ("Seevnick"). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Toyota and Seevnick as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,973,857 issued to Hughes ("Hughes"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 5-6 by virtue of their dependency from claim 1 include all the features of claim 1. For similar reasons as discussed above, with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Toyota fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Additionally, Seevnick and/or Hughes fails to cure the deficiencies of Toyota. Applicant submits that claims 5-6 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 5 and 6.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Advisory Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott J. Hawranek, No. 52,411
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5920 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax

2 / 23, 2009